

Hon. Tupper, Charles

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER, K.C.M.G., C.B.,

Minister of Railways and Canals,

DURING THE

DEBATE ON THE BUDGET.

HOUSE OF COMMONS — SESSION, 1882.

OTTAWA :

Printed by MACLEAN, ROGER & Co., Wellington Street.

1882.

HON. SIR CHARLES TUPPER'S SPEECH

ON

THE BUDGET.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the important discussion which was opened here on Friday last, and which dealt with the great question at issue between the two parties in this country, I desire to say, as I have always said, that I have no intention of discussing the question of Free Trade and Protection as an abstract question. I would be quite prepared to admit that, even if in England, the policy adopted long since, and now in force, of Free Trade, was the best policy that could be adopted for that country, it would in no way affect the issue between the parties here. I hold that, notwithstanding the very striking evidence that we have that many of the ablest and most intelligent minds in that great country are seriously considering this important question, and are entertaining very grave doubts as to the wisdom of the policy of Free Trade for the Empire.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear; but I would like to ask him if there is no significance in such a result as was recently witnessed in the great constituency of the North Riding of Yorkshire——

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; there is not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where this question was made a battle ground of party, and where one of the most important and influential constituencies in the Empire reversed its verdict and pronounced unequivocally in favor of a policy of Protection, even to the extent of a duty on corn? Well, Sir, as I said before, if I were quite prepared to admit that the policy of Free Trade was the best to be adopted in the British Empire and by Great Britain, I should, at the same time, maintain that, situated as Canada is, we have no alternative but to adopt the policy now in force in this country. It is impossible, Sir, and any one must admit it who takes the trouble to look at the position Canada occupies, with a comparatively small population of between

4,000,000 and 5,000,000 of people, and lying alongside the great country to the south of us, now numbering 50,000,000 ; it is impossible, Sir, I say, for any public man to examine this question and arrive at any other conclusion than that the policy of Canada must be greatly influenced by the fiscal policy of the great country to the south of us. And, Sir, I think it would be wise to adopt the advice of Carlyle: "examine history for it is philosophy, teaching by experience," and- looking at the question in the light of that important axiom, ask ourselves what the result of fourteen years experience in relation to this question has been for Canada, what inference has been drawn from the policy of the two great parties in this country by the experience gained in relation to these questions for the last fifteen years? It is well known, Sir, that the party who now enjoy the confidence of the people of this country adopted, from the first, a policy of protecting Canadian industries.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An hon. member on the other side of the House questions that statement; but, Sir, I think I shall be able to show that hon. gentleman that the low Tariff of 1867, adopted by the party now in power, was as protective a policy as was required in the interests of Canada in that day. Hon. gentlemen may say that the Tariff of Canada had been reduced in 1866. Why reduced? Because the reduced Tariff of 1866, adopted before Confederation, was a Tariff found to be all that was necessary in order to give the protection required for Canadian industries. It is well known, Sir, that the great war, which existed from 1861 to 1865, in the United States, so completely disorganized the labor market of that country as to afford for many subsequent years quite as full and as abundant a protection to Canadian industries as the present Tariff. The hon. gentleman knows right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted at the first Session of the first Parliament of this Dominion, the policy was then adopted of fostering and protecting Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen know right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted, it was accompanied by measures calculated to foster these industries. Look at the free list, and you will find that the policy was to provide for the free introduction of articles required to be consumed and to be used in manufacturing industries to a much larger extent than was subsequently the case. Then taking the great interest of shipbuilding, the policy was adopted of fostering that great and important industry by making articles that entered into the construction of shipping and that had to be imported into this country free of duty. Then

the industry of sailing these ships that were built was also fostered by adopting a policy of making the light dues which rested on the vessel a Government charge. So with regard to all other industries, every effort was made to give such protection as the industries of the country at that period required. Take the question of machinery. At that time it is well known that within Canada you could obtain but a very small amount of machinery, owing to the absence of any manufactory of machinery. The policy of the first Parliament, and of the first Tariff that was enacted in this Dominion, was a policy of allowing all machinery that could not be manufactured in the country to be admitted free of duty for the purpose of fostering the establishment of new industries within the borders of Canada. Then, Sir, we had the question of the fisheries, one of the largest and most important industries in this country. What was done for this industry? In the first instance, every person knows that, with the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, the market which had been open to our fishermen had been closed. What did we do? The Government of Canada decided to foster and protect our own fishermen, and to prevent encroachment upon our fishing grounds by fishermen from the United States, and this gave all the protection to our fishermen that they could receive. Every person remembers the taunts and ridicule that were thrown from the other side of the House at our efforts in that respect. Every person remembers the taunts with reference to Mr. Mitchell's fleet used for the purpose of protecting that industry. Not only did we do that, but we imposed a tonnage license upon American fishermen coming into our waters, and when a license of 50 cents a ton was found not to be adequate protection we raised it to \$2. Having thus shown a firm resolve to protect the undoubted rights of our fishermen in our waters, the United States were brought to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that question arranged by a treaty; and it is well known, Sir, that the result of the Washington Treaty was not only to re-open the American markets to the fishermen of this country—under the policy of Protection we had adopted—but it was agreed, under that Treaty, that means should be taken to ascertain what amount of money should be paid by the United States Government to Canada for the enjoyment of our fisheries. Every person who was present in this House at the time remembers the taunts and sneers flung across the floor of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to that matter, when we were told that nothing would be obtained. But, Sir, as an outcome of that Washington Treaty, and of the efforts of hon. gentlemen then and now on this side of the House to protect the interests of our

fishermen, no less a sum than \$4,500,000 was awarded to be paid to Canada; and, to-day, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, true to the policy of protecting that great and important Canadian industry, is in a position to come down and ask justly from this House that no less than \$150,000 per annum shall be contributed by this Parliament from the public funds as a bounty to the fishermen, whose fishing grounds have been, to a certain extent surrendered, under the Washington Treaty, to the fishermen of another country. I mention this in order to show that the policy which animates gentlemen on this side of the House is a policy that was adopted in 1867, on the first formation of the Canadian Government, and has continued until the present time. Well, Sir, it will also be remembered by gentlemen opposite that we made a very strong endeavor to secure protection for the great coal mining interests of this country and for the great agricultural industry. It will be remembered that the Government of that day—the first of this Confederation—brought down a policy imposing a duty upon coal coming from the United States into this country, and accompanied it by a proposition to impose a duty upon grain and breadstuffs brought from the adjoining Republic into Canada. It will be remembered that, notwithstanding that that policy was maintained for a year, we were obliged ultimately to succumb to the united hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of our own friends who were less advanced on this important question at that time than, I am happy to say, they are to-day. Now, Sir, it is very well known to the House that I have always been—from the first hour I entered this House—an advocate for a duty on coal. I never could see, and I cannot now, why coal should be exempt from duty, even as a pure question of revenue, any more than any other article found in the Tariff. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House join issue with us in that respect, and the ex-Minister of Finance calls a duty on coal an odious tax, while the hon. leader of the Opposition maintains here, as elsewhere, that it is a sectional tax. Well Sir, I can only say that I fail to see any foundation for the statement that it is an odious tax, or for the view that it is a sectional tax. What makes it an odious tax? Why, these hon. gentlemen say coal is a necessary of life! Yet the Tariff they propounded and maintained, provided for the imposition of duties upon other articles which are just as much necessities of life as coal. In this cold country, hats, boots and shoes, and clothing of all kinds, are necessities of life. It is not a matter of choice as to whether any individual in this country will wear these articles or not; they are articles of prime necessity, and

yet hon. gentlemen opposite never discovered that, because these articles are absolutely necessary to maintain life in this country, they should be struck from the list of dutiable goods and put on the free list. Hon. gentlemen know right well that coal oil is as much a necessity of life in Canada as coal, and yet what was their policy with regard to it? Why, my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby)—I beg to be excused for mentioning him by name—aided by all the Conservative strength that at that time was to be found in this House, was two years fighting the battle to bring down the duty on coal oil to a figure below 150 per cent. The hon. the ex-Finance Minister, although now so anxious about articles which are necessities of life, was prepared to maintain then an odious tax of 150 per cent. on the article of coal oil, and was only compelled to surrender at discretion when he found he was being pushed to the wall and that outside opinion overwhelmingly supported his opponents. Was the duty on coal oil a sectional tax? I would like to ask the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition if a tax on coal oil is not as much a sectional tax as a tax on coal. There is no coal oil to be found outside of Ontario. Whatever advantage was enjoyed by the industry, in consequence of the duty, inured to Ontario where the oil was to be found. Yet the duty was not called an odious or a sectional tax because oil was an Ontario product, yet these gentlemen feel that it is quite right to denounce the tax on coal found in Nova Scotia as odious and sectional, while, at the same time, they resisted a fair and legitimate reduction on coal oil, the duty on which was, as I said before, not only equally odious but equally sectional, being four times as great as the duty on coal, as the hon. gentleman knows. I say, too, that these gentlemen have never been able to show, here or elsewhere, any reason why a duty should not be imposed on coal, the same as upon any other necessary of life. I may mention, as another evidence of our desire to foster and protect the industries of this country, that between 1867 and 1873, when we found we had more revenue than we required to maintain the public service in efficiency, we abolished the duties upon tea and coffee; and we did that essentially in the interests of the industries of this country, and with a view to fostering those industries, because it cheapened the cost of living, and in that way permitted the carrying on of the industries in a better and easier mode than otherwise was the case. Well, Sir, in an unhappy hour for the interests of Canada, gentlemen opposite came into power—not in virtue of the express sentiment of the country, not in virtue of a decision of the people at a time when the issues between the two parties were laid before them—because in

the General Election of 1872, the policy that had animated the Conservative party, the policy that had been so eminently successful in the promotion of the prosperity of Canada, was heartily endorsed by the people at the polls. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen failed to secure the people at the polls on a policy of their own, and they adopted a system which is a favorite mode of operating with them—intrigue; and thus they succeeded in obtaining power. I say, Sir, that this was an unhappy hour in the interests of Canada, for I need not remind the House, Sir, that from that hour down to the time when they were dismissed from the positions for which they proved so thoroughly unequal, the fortunes of Canada were surrendered to hands utterly unequal to the occasion. They succeeded to power with an overflowing revenue; they succeeded to power with the trade, the business and the revenue of the country in the highest possible state of efficiency, and I need not tell the House, Sir, what the lamentable record of that five years of misrule was, during which they supplanted the protectionist policy which had been the policy of Canada down to that time, and introduced a policy of what they called out-and-out Free Trade—at least, to as large an extent as they could adopt it. Well, Sir, they have said on more than one occasion—I do not know, however, that the matter is very important—that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and myself, as well as other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, were formerly Free Traders. They have said, Sir—and they have endeavored to establish on various platforms and occasionally in this House the fact—that formerly my hon. friend and myself held different sentiments in reference to this great issue from those which we now entertain. I say, Sir, that the history of the past will fail to establish any such proposition. I do not, for a moment, hesitate to avow that when I was in the Government of Nova Scotia, and when I had the honor of occupying a position in the Legislature of that Province, I was a Free Trader. My policy was that of Free Trade, and why? Because it was utterly impossible for a small community of less than 400,000 people, situated as we were, without the means of obtaining a market outside of our own borders, even among Canadians, for any but a Free Trade policy to be adopted; but, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite know little of the discussions of the past if they do not know that my hon. friend and myself took our ground in our respective Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick strongly and clearly on the advantage of having all these Provinces united together in one great Confederation, and that one of the leading grounds on which we urged this change was, that it would enable a policy that

would protect the industries of the country, to be adopted, and which otherwise was impossible. I say, Sir, that when the Reciprocity Treaty was abolished by the United States, as leader of the Government at that time. I went down to the Legislature of Nova Scotia and asked the Legislature to re-impose all the duties that were in operation previous to the treaty, and which had been suspended during the continuance of the treaty, and to adopt the same system in this relation, which had before existed; and, Sir, as I have said before, I, on all occasions pointed out to my countrymen, that while nature had given to Nova Scotia great natural resources, and such as had made other countries great manufacturing centres, and had built up flourishing and immense industries, it was utterly impossible for any such result to follow, unless we became part of a great Confederation, opening up an extensive market within ourselves, by which such industries could be fostered. I am told, Sir, that some remark which I made on the occasion of the introduction of the Tariff of the ex-Finance Minister, gave evidence that I was an out-and-out Free-Trader. Well, Sir, all I can say to this is, that if hon. gentlemen opposite will refer to the files of the *Globe* newspaper, they will find that I attacked the hon. gentleman's Tariff on that occasion on the ground that it took away the protection—the fostering protection—which was given by the Tariff that had previously existed, to Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen will discover that on that occasion I joined issue with the ex-Minister of Finance on the question of the proposed duties on shipbuilding, and I said: “Here is a great Canadian industry. It is in a position that will not bear tampering with, and yet I find that one of your first moves is to take away the protection which this industry has enjoyed, owing to the freedom from duty upon articles which go into the construction of ships, and are imported into this country.” And I was able to fight the battle so sharply on that occasion, with the aid of my friends on this side of the House, that we compelled the hon. gentleman to take back his Tariff, readjust it, and make it much less obnoxious than it was before. I told the hon. gentleman in that debate—as will be found in the report to which I refer—that he was attacking the industries of Canada by imposing a duty on machinery which was brought into Canada, and this, too, when there was no corresponding aid given to the manufacturers, who were to bring such machinery into this country, so that, from the beginning to the end, Sir, I took the ground that that hon. gentleman was striking a fatal blow at Canadian industries in his Tariff, and defended the policy of fostering the industries of Canada as far as it was in my power to do

so on that occasion. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman was successful, and what was his first move? The leader of the Opposition at Cobourg said that what they proposed to do was to foster industries by taking the duties off all articles which went into manufacturing, by increasing the free list. But what did the Government of which the hon. gentleman and the ex-Minister of Finance were members do when they had the power? Did they promote the industries of Canada by taking the duties off articles such as I have mentioned, and by enlarging the free list? No, Sir, but they struck a heavy blow at the industries of Canada by imposing duties on a large number of articles which entered into the consumption of manufactures in this country, taking them out of the free list and imposing duties on them. Then, Sir, I need not say that another step of these hon. gentlemen in the same direction was the reimposition of the duties on tea and coffee. These hon. gentlemen now profess—as hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are very apt to profess when they have not any power to deal with the subject—a deep anxiety for the poor man; but who does not remember, when they brought down a measure to levy duties on tea and coffee, that they banded themselves together to a man and voted down the resolution which was proposed by my hon. friend, who then and now represents Montreal, with the view of having these duties so adjusted as to lighten the tax on the poor man. Under their Tariff the rich man, who is able to drink tea that costs 90 cents or \$1 a pound, had to pay no larger tax into the revenue, and had to contribute no more to the revenue, than did the poor man, who was only able to drink tea worth 25 cents a pound. These gentlemen were then deaf to the claims and difficulties of the poor man, and without compunction voted down the resolution that would have modified the unfairness of the Tariff, which was putting a heavy duty on tea and coffee. Well, Sir, they then imposed taxes on articles which were in the free list, and they burthened the industries of the country with exactions; and at the very time when all was changed, and when all was changing, these hon. gentlemen imposed duties on the shipbuilding industry, and they imposed duties on the great bulk of our industrial community by the levying of a tax on tea and coffee, and struck off the protection which had existed with reference to Canadian trade in tea, by removing the differential duty which had hitherto enabled this trade to be carried on in Canada. Everything that these hon. gentlemen could do to make Boston and New York the commercial capitals of Canada they did do, and with what result? With the result, as I have said before, that during the five years that these hon. gentlemen

were in power, and that this policy of taking away the protection which had been given by their predecessors to Canadian industries prevailed, of making the poor man poorer, and of bringing this country into a condition such as every Canadian, of whatever stripe of politics he might be, earnestly deplored, and such as every patriotic Canadian can never wish again to see in this country. I defended the duty upon coal when we were in power in the first instance. We maintained that principle as long as we could; and when we returned to power we reverted to our original policy—the same policy of fostering Canadian industries that had animated us from the first. We returned to it, and publicly proclaimed, as we did years before, that it was a proper principle, when we urged upon them the vital importance, in the interest of the country, of changing that policy in this respect. We did all that men could who were in a minority to induce them to adopt a policy which we believed would be successful in changing the financial condition of the country. I had pointed out repeatedly the experience of that great nation to the south of us, which had adopted the policy of protection to foster the industries of the country, with the result of relieving it from the disastrous consequences of its great Civil War. I talked, however, to deaf ears. But, having received the mandate of the people to deal with the great question of the financial policy of the country—having declared, with no uncertain sound, what the policy was which animated us, and would inspire us if again entrusted with power, the result of our appeal to the country was to sustain the policy we had adopted here, and which we had pledged ourselves to carry out if once more entrusted with power. Well, we reimposed the duty on coal—that odious tax which hon. gentlemen opposite had succeeded in striking down, but which I have shown here, as a pure question of revenue, can be defended on that ground as successfully as any question that can be discussed. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, dealt with this subject, and that is perhaps the only part of his speech with which I was inclined to differ—he stated that one-half the duty on coal was paid in the United States. On the other hand, the ex-Finance Minister, the other day, quoted from a speech of my colleague, the Speaker of the Senate, in reference to the imposition of the duty on coal; and I am quite aware that, years ago, that hon. gentleman and a number of other hon. gentlemen associated with the Conservative party were not so advanced as they are to-day in regard to this subject. I am glad, however, that the hon. gentleman opposite has quoted that as part of the argument which he deemed conclusive in reference to this public question. By-and-bye, however, I shall invite

him to pay the same respect to the views of the Speaker of the Senate on another point which will come under consideration, which he has shown in relation to this question. Now, when I was down in Picton, I made a speech to which the hon. gentleman opposite did me the honor of alluding. He said I stated we had placed a duty on coal which fell mainly upon 1,500,000 people of Ontario. My opponent questioned the right to have a sectional tax, but I pointed to the fact that the ex-Finance Minister had set an example of supporting and sustaining a sectional tax. I pointed to the fact that that hon. gentleman had placed a duty on petroleum of 150 per cent. on an article that was solely the product of Ontario, and which was largely paid by the other Provinces. Then again, duties were placed on the 100,000 tons of shipping in the Maritime Provinces, that would have produced \$100,000 under the Tariff which the hon. gentleman brought down. While 600,000 people in the Maritime Provinces would have to contribute \$100,000 of revenue under the hon. gentleman's Tariff, 1,500,000 people in Ontario were asked to contribute a little over \$7,000 under his adjustment of that duty. But that did not prevent the hon. gentleman from proceeding further in the same direction. He showed no objection to the adoption of a sectional tax, provided it fell on the shoulders of the Maritime Provinces, saying, in effect, that supposing such duties were not paid in Ontario, the arrangement was all right. But under our policy we provided for legitimate protection to all the industries of all the Provinces; and while hon. gentlemen ask for the imposition of some burdens in matters in which Ontario is more interested, there is another instance in which, according to their own showing, the tax is not paid by them but by the people of the Lower Provinces—is certainly not paid by the people of Ontario. Now, we maintain a principle—I have advocated it from the moment I had a seat in Parliament, I have never ceased to uphold it. I defy any man who has read the discussion of this question, in the *Mail* newspaper, which has been going on for the last three or four months, who has candidly and dispassionately weighed the arguments published in that journal, I defy any man who will approach this subject in a fair and candid spirit, to arrive at any other conclusion than that the coal tax is not paid by the people of Ontario, although paid in Ontario. I venture to state, and have sufficient grounds for the statement, that the imposition of the coal duty has not cost the people of Canada one farthing, either in Ontario or out of it. I take this position, and shall give the House my grounds for it, that, instead of the duty on coal having increased the price to the people of Ontario, it has reduced it. I hold that, from the hour of

the imposition of that duty down to this hour, Canadians have paid a smaller price for this article than formerly. It is on this point I differ slightly from my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who seemed to think that, perhaps, half the duty might be paid in the United States and half in Ontario. I am satisfied my hon. friend had not given that branch of the subject the close and exhaustive examination which I have felt it my duty to give it, or he would have arrived at the opinion I now unhesitatingly state, that the imposition of the duty has not cost the people of this country anything, but the reverse. Now, Sir, my first position is that the price of coal from the United States is fixed and governed by the competition that coal has to meet with. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who does not know, from the practical experience of every day, that the tariff in a railway changes with different seasons of the year, being governed and largely caused by the amount of competition that the tariff meets with. If you are carrying freight to a competitive point, if you are carrying freight to an open port where you have to compete with water carriage, you put your freight down in order to get the business that you would otherwise lose. If the railway is carrying freight to an inland portion of the country, where there is no such competition, you impose such a charge as you think the work performed is fairly entitled to. Now, I maintain that a close examination of this question will prove beyond controversy that, looking at it in the light of experience, which is, as I have said before, the test to which I propose to subject this matter, the House will be driven—I say, with reference to this side of the House, willingly driven, because we are open to conviction in a clear and strong case, but unwillingly driven on the other side of the House—to come to the conclusion at which I have arrived. The moment that the duty was imposed upon coal going into Ontario, it became a competitive point, because they were threatened with the fact of their coal being displaced by the introduction of Nova Scotia coal. The hon. member for Lambton, the other night, seemed to think that the whole question was as to whether we had succeeded in displacing the coal. It is not necessary to the success of our policy to displace the coal at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing is necessary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will examine this question a little further, he will find that—provided you stimulate the production, provided you succeed in giving work to the miners and employment to the twelve or fifteen million dollars of capital that have been invested in the mining operations of this country, and

employment to the miner in raising the coal—it matters little where it is consumed, provided that policy has led to this increased consumption. But, Sir, I may say that, after the most careful examination of this question, it has been found that no coal is superior to that produced in the Province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from London (Mr. Carling) was at one time Minister of Public Works for Ontario, and his Department caused a careful and exhaustive analysis to be made of the comparative values of the different kinds of bituminous coal. It was then found, as a result of that analysis, that the cheapest coal that could be purchased for the use of the public buildings in the city of Toronto, was Nova Scotia coal. It is well known, although I do not consider it necessary to the argument, that some 284,000 tons of additional coal has been sent into the Upper Provinces under the influence of this Tariff. Before that a very large amount of coal was displaced, but the result, as I said before, could be obtained without displacing necessarily the coal in Ontario. Now, I quote from the Trade Returns of home consumption, showing the imports of anthracite into the several Provinces from the United States, and the average cost per ton. What do these tables show? Why, Sir, they show that, in Ontario, in 1877, there were 261,895 tons imported, costing \$1,163,944, or \$4.45 per ton—that was before the imposition of any duty; in 1878, there were 266,434 tons imported, at a cost of \$1,022,816, or \$3.85 per ton; in 1880, there were 335,794 tons imported, costing \$1,022,055, or \$3.04 per ton; in 1881, there were 357,524 tons imported, costing \$1,522,375, or \$4.25 per ton. So that we have never reached, down to the present time, the cost per ton of anthracite coal coming into the city of Toronto; it has never reached the price that was placed upon that article before there was the imposition of one cent of duty. In Quebec, in 1877, there were imported 117,124 tons, costing \$468,759, or \$4 per ton,—mark, Sir, that Quebec, though much further from the point of production, was a point of sharp competition, and the result was that, instead of having to pay in Quebec \$4.45 a ton, as they paid in Toronto, they only paid \$4 a ton; in 1878, \$3.15; in 1880, \$2.65, when the 50 cents duty was imposed; and in 1881, \$3.77. In Nova Scotia competition was still greater, and the distance was much greater also. The anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania as you will observe, are at the furthest point, and yet the cost of the anthracite coal of Nova Scotia was far lower than either in Ontario or Quebec, both of which were much nearer to the point of production. In 1877, the importation was 11,887 tons, costing \$44,560, or \$3.74 per ton; in 1878, the average cost was \$2.93 per ton; in 1880, \$2.58; in 1881, \$3.70. In

New Brunswick it cost \$4 per ton, the same as in Quebec in 1877; \$3.46 in 1878; \$2.81 in 1880, when the duty was imposed; and \$3.70 in 1881. So that here you have the fact clearly established that the very moment the duty was imposed the parties who shipped their coals to Toronto and Quebec, put those places into a different category from what they were before, they made them competitive points and reduced the cost of coal to a larger extent than the amount of duty paid. It is impossible for any impartial mind to arrive at any other conclusion than that the imposition of a duty of 50 cents a ton has not only not increased the cost to the consumer, but it has lowered the cost to the consumer in Ontario. The following is the table from which I have been quoting:

Province.	Year.	Tons.	Total Cost.	Cost per Ton.
			\$	\$ cts.
Ontario.....	1877	261,895	1,163,944	4 45
	1878	266,434	1,022,816	85
	1880	335,794	1,022,055	3 04
	1881	357,524	1,522,375	4 25
Quebec.. ..	1877	117,124	468,759	4 00
	1878	105,384	333,836	3 15
	1880	142,239	378,150	2 65
	1881	161,449	608,813	3 77
Nova Scotia.....	1877	11,877	44,560	3 74
	1878	10,592	31,169	2 93
	1880	12,513	32,467	2 58
	1881	15,969	54,661	3 70
New Brunswick	1877	23,223	92,823	4 00
	1878	21,240	73,555	3 46
	1880	24,232	68,095	2 81
	1881	28,243	104,807	3 70

It will be at once apparent that the price of coal in 1880 was less than in 1878, the first named year being the year after the imposition of the duty, and the second named year being the year immediately preceding it. So you here have that additional fact; in other words, there was a drop in the price as invoiced to Canadian dealers immediately after the National Policy was adopted, just as the Grand Trunk Railway puts its fare up when the St. Lawrence is closed, and puts its fare down when the St. Lawrence is open, simply because in one case they have to meet competition, and, in the other case, they have no competition. Bituminous coal followed the same rule, and the United States practically ceased sending any into the Dominion,

with the exception of Ontario, where the invoiced prices, as per Customs returns, show an average of \$3.23 per ton for 1881, as against \$3.67 for 1877. That shows the United States coal owners feared less the competition with Nova Scotia, because they found that it had not been sent forward to the extent they feared it would be, and they increased the price to a certain extent: Now, Sir, I think I have shown that the price of coal varies in the United States according to the degree of competition experienced by it from the coal from Nova Scotia and Great Britain; otherwise you would not have coal sent to Quebec at a lower price, you would not have coal sent a longer distance than it is to Toronto from the Pennsylvania coal fields. In Boston, a sea-board city of the United States, the price of coal is \$6.50. In the inland city of Chicago the price is \$8.50. How do hon. gentlemen account for that? The cost of carrying to the city of Boston, and the cost of carrying to Chicago is the same. I have under my hand a periodical published in New York, called *Coal*, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to verify the statement, he will find that the cost of carriage to Chicago and to Boston is the same—\$2 in each case—yet the price of coal in Boston is \$6.50, while in Chicago it is \$8.50, showing that the price of coal is fixed by the coal dealers and by the amount of competition. In Chicago there is no competition with British or Nova Scotia coal, and the consequence is that the price is put up to just the highest point the coal dealers can place it; showing again, Sir, as I have stated, that this question of its being placed on the competitive, or the non-competitive position, affects the price of coal. My authority for the statement I have made as to the freight rate to Boston is the Boston *Herald's* commercial report, and a periodical published in New York called *Coal*, and dated the 25th of January. The receipts of Nova Scotia and English coal into Boston, in 1880, were 54,781 tons. In 1881, somewhat more; and a large proportion of the coal import in 1881 was from Nova Scotia, as Cape Breton coal owners endeavored to force it into that market at \$3.50 per ton. No coal was supplied to Chicago from others than the Pennsylvania coal fields. I think, under these circumstances, the House will have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the several ports of Canada (and of Ontario especially) were, by reason of the duty imposed upon foreign coal, removed by the Pennsylvania coal owners from the list of non-competitive points to the list of competitive points. The proof of this is the fact that the Boston wholesale price, to dealers of anthracite, in 1881, was \$4.20, while the wholesale price in Toronto, of the same kind of coal, was, in 1881, \$4.20. The authority in this case is the

Boston *Herald's* commercial article for the Boston price, and, for the Toronto price, the Customs returns and the following table, which gives the total import of coal into Ontario, and the price of anthracite, compared with Philadelphia—a non-competitive point:—

Year.	Quantity.	Cost of market of purchase.	Price per ton.	Philadelphia wholesale price.	Philadelphia more than Ontario.	Philadelphia less than Ontario.
	Tons.	\$	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1877.....	420,010	1,793,407	4.27	2 59	1.68
1878.....	406,971	1,476,022	3.62	3.22	1.00
1879 to March 15 ...	322,528	1,252,703	3.88	2.89	1.00
1879 after March 15	93,895	245,255	2 71	2.37½
1880.....	516,729	1,509,960	2.92	4 53	1 61
1881.....	344,833	1,499,143	4.34	4.90	1.00

This table shows, first, that prior to the 15th of March, 1879, the Philadelphia dealer purchased his coal at a cheaper rate than the Ontario coal dealer; second, that after the imposition of the duty, the average price of the Ontario coal dealers was less than that of Philadelphia in 1880, by \$1.61, and in the fiscal year of 1881, by 56 cents. If we compare Toronto with Philadelphia, we find that Toronto coal dealers obtained their supply during the calendar year 1881, at \$4.20 per ton against Philadelphia at \$4.90, or 70 cents less than Philadelphia; and if the duty were added to the price of the coal, there would still be a large margin in favor of Toronto against Philadelphia. Further evidence is to be found in the fact that coal sold at Ogdensburg, in the winter of 1880-81, for \$5.90, while at Prescott the retail price was \$6 per ton; the cost of freight to Prescott, harbor dues and unloading is 68 cents. If the duty were added to the cost of the coal, it ought to have sold at \$5.90 plus 68 cents plus 50 cents, or in all \$7.08. At Oswego, coal sold during the present year, at \$5.75; freight, from Oswego to Belleville, 40 cents; harbor dues and unloading, 28 cents; if duty were added to cost, 50 cents, the coal ought to sell at \$6.93, while the price at Belleville was \$6.50, showing that the result of the duty has been to decrease and not to increase the price of coal. At Buffalo, coal sells the present winter for \$5.70; the freight to Toronto is \$1; cartage 30 cents, or equal to \$7. The freight in this case is given on the authority of railway companies, that being the rate from the Bridge to Toronto for all quantities of coal under 10,000 tons. In summer rates are lower, Mr. Nairn,

a coal dealer of Toronto, placing the freight at 70 cents during the summer. The price of coal then was \$6.50, in Toronto. During the present month the price of coal, in Toronto, was advertised at \$6.50, by P. Burns, a leading coal dealer. At that price, with winter rates of freight, coal is obtained by consumers at 50 cents less than the consumers of Buffalo pay for it. At Chicago, coal retails at from \$8 to \$8.50, or an average of \$8.25. The rail freight from Buffalo is \$2; the difference in freight is 70 cents in favor of Toronto. If Toronto paid as much as Chicago it ought to pay \$8.25 minus 70 cents, or \$7.55; if the duty is added to the cost to the consumer, Toronto, to have its coal at the same proportionate rate as Chicago, would have to pay \$7.55 and duty 50 cents, or \$8.05. It actually pays \$6.50 to \$7. At Detroit coal sells at retail for \$6.25; freight from Buffalo 50 cents. The price at Toronto is \$6.50, with freight \$1, ought to be \$6.70, to be proportionately as dear as Detroit. In further proof that the duty is not paid by the people of Ontario see following table of the retail prices in Toronto at the several dates mentioned:—

	Hard Coal.	Soft Coal.
Oct 24, 1872	\$7.00.....	\$8.00
" 23, 1873	7.50.....	7.00
" 22, 1874.....	7.75.....	7.00
" 30, 1875	7.00.....	5.75
" 25, 1881.....	6.50.....	5.50

In 1881, with the duty of 50 cents in operation, the cost at Toronto of hard coal was \$6.50, and soft coal \$5.50, the lowest price at which this table shows it to have been purchased since 1872.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was it in 1880?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This table does not give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it is a very convenient table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am taking the figures in this table from the prices furnished by the *Toronto Globe*—a table which shows that in no year between 1872 and 1875 inclusive, when there was no duty on coal, was coal as cheap in Toronto as it has been in 1881, with the duty fully established; so that the hon. gentleman will have to work at that table a good deal before he will be able to invalidate the conclusive argument which I have adduced therefrom—that the imposition of the duty on coal has been in favor of the Ontario consumer, so far as the price of coal is concerned. The *Philadelphia Ledger*, in December, said:

"Coal demand has been in excess of the ability of the companies to furnish it. It is really just cause for apprehension for the future, should the trouble of want of water or other causes continue to limit production."

This was said because of the drought of last season ; nevertheless, Toronto coal supply was cheaper to it than in full production years. Now, Sir, I have another table to which I wish to invite the attention of hon. gentlemen, as showing what the effect of the National Policy has been on this great and important industry. It is a comparative statement of the coal sales, labor, &c., in Nova Scotia, for 1873, the last year of the Macdonald Government ; 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie rule ; and, 1879 to 1881, three years under the National Policy. It shows the decrease under the Mackenzie Administration and the increase under the National Policy :

	1873.	1878.	Decrease in 1878.	1881.	Increase in 1881 over 1878.
Coal sales from Nova Scotia mines.....	881,106	693,511	187,595	1,034,800	341,289
The number of men employed.....	4,362	3,135	1,227	3,600	465
Number of days worked at coal.....	995,153	663,850	331,303	817,595	183,705
Tons of coal shipped from Nova Scotia to Montreal and Quebec.....	187,059	83,710	103,349	268,628	184,918
Total imports of coal at Montreal and Quebec....	415,380	328,074	87,306	529,091	201,017
Coal shipments from Cape Breton to Montreal and Quebec.....	80,213	28,108	52,105	146,122	118,014
Total tons of coal shipped from Sydney Harbor.....	253,396	128,061	125,335	258,961	130,900
Tonnage of ships arrived in Port Sydney.....	222,999	215,061	7,938	406,082	191,021

I give to hon. gentlemen opposite these facts and figures, which establish beyond question the fact that, so far from the people of Ontario having suffered from the imposition of a coal duty, the very reverse has been the case.

Mr. ANGLIN. By the Upper Provinces, I presume the hon. gentleman means Quebec and Ontario.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I mean Quebec and Ontario. At Cobourg, where I had the pleasure, at no very remote period, of discussing before the people—if not in the presence of the hon. leader of the Opposition—this very important question, I was able to deal with a very remarkable argument which he gave in favor of reducing the duty on coal. And what do hon. gentlemen suppose it was ? And, Sir, I may say, while referring to that, that the ex-Finance Minister, the other night, gave us the same reason. He

said, what a frightful injustice to railways. It was not the poor man then on whose behalf he complained—because I may say that these “shivering wretches” to whom the hon. ex-Finance Minister has referred, are not known to us. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the day is not remote when there were shivering wretches suffering from want of employment, and without the comforts of life. But I am happy to know that, under the policy now in operation in this country, all that is changed. Where there was misery and cold there is now comfort and happiness. But I say that coal is not the fuel of the poor man in Canada. I say that for nineteen-twentieths of the poor people of Canada wood is their fuel, and the price of coal does not touch the question at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman say that of Toronto, where the great consumption of coal is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it of Canada. There are other places in this country besides Toronto, although the hon. gentleman does make it his home.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows that in the country districts the people have not the necessity nor the means of getting coal; but where coal is consumed, is it consumed by the rich or the poor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought I made it plain to the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of no moment to them, because I have shown that the poor man of Toronto gets his coal cheaper under the National Policy than he did before. But I say that, taking this whole Dominion, wood is the fuel of the poor man, and therefore it is a delusion for these hon. gentlemen to dwell on the price of coal as a hardship to the poor. I have shown that it is not a hardship but a benefit to the poor. The hon. gentlemen were greatly alarmed for two classes, and who were they they? Why, Sir, they were the railways and the manufacturers. I thought these manufacturers were bloated aristocrats, that you could not take too much out of. But, Sir, it appears that these hon. gentlemen as the day approaches when they have to be put in the balance and weighed, are becoming very sensitive in regard to the manufacturers, and they want coal put on the free list in order to increase the enormous profits to these manufacturers. Suppose the manufacturer had to pay an addition of 50 cents a ton on coal, he was able to pay it, because we had given him an increased production. We had provided for fostering and protecting his industry against the slaughtering from the neighboring country that formerly crushed it out, and thus enabled him to pay this additional 50 cents a not

without feeling it. But, Sir, what about the railways? Have the railways any ground for complaint? How was the hon. the ex-Finance Minister able to make a case in respect to the railway? By quoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler? No; but by misquoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler. The hon. gentleman put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered. I challenge him on this point. I say more. I say the hon. gentleman, who entertains such a very low estimate of human nature as his speech the other night led us to believe he holds, ought to be careful how he places words in the mouth of any man that the man never uttered, because it is open to the imputation that the hon. gentleman's knowledge was not at fault. Now, Sir, I tell him, if he did not know it, he ought to have known it; and I tell you why. This subject had been a matter of public discussion. The *Globe* newspaper had falsified the report of Sir Henry Tyler's speech. Either the *Globe's* correspondent in London, or the persons at the *Globe* office in Toronto, falsified Sir Henry Tyler's language and made him say that which he never had said. That became a subject of discussion, and the *Globe* was challenged with the production of Sir Henry Tyler's speech, which proved the statement I have made, namely, that either the correspondent in London or the parties in the office at Toronto were so driven to the wall to sustain their untenable position on this question, that they had to do what the hon. ex-Finance Minister, after this has been a matter of public discussion, ought not to have done,—put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Produce the speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have got it here, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that not only does it not say what he has stated that it said, but the very reverse. Sir Henry Tyler, of course, like all gentlemen in his position, was anxious to show why he had not a larger net balance in favor of the railway, and he would have been only too glad if he could have shown that the imposition of the duty of 50 cents per ton on coal had compelled him to take that 50 cents out of the earnings of the railway in order to adjust his balance, but he did not venture to say so; he could not say so, because I happen to know that the Grand Trunk had purchased coal cheaper than the company had purchased it before, and therefore Sir Henry Tyler was not in a position to make such a statement. He said:

"He gives us all the reasons for the excess in the expenditure of the present half year, which you will see on page 12—increased consumption of fuel caused by much severer weather during the past winter. 2nd. Advance in prices of fuel, wages, and materials. 3rd. Outlay in working

the extra traffic, which, of course, requires extra fuel; and so on. As regards fuel, I should like to tell you what we are doing in that respect. We are gradually economizing, and using more coal and less wood."

Sir Henry Tyler was made to say that his company was suffering, that the Grand Trunk and all the railways were suffering to the extent of the duty on coal. He tells the people that, although he had not got as large a balance as he desired, he was increasing it, because the company was using more coal and less wood. He said:

"In the half-year ending June, 1880, we used 60,000 cords of wood, and in the half-year ending June, 1881, only 48,000 cords. *Per contra*, we used in the half-year ending June, 1880, 109,000 tons of coal; so that we had a decrease of 12,000 cords of wood and an increase of 34,000 tons of coal. As wood becomes more scarce, and there are extra facilities for getting coal, we shall hope, in working our traffic, to effect further economy in this respect."

The hon. the ex-Finance Minister put language in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth which he never uttered.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that not enough to show that Sir Henry Tyler did not say what has been reported? Is it not quite enough to show that there is no foundation for that which *Hansard* shows the ex-Finance Minister stated, and the words he put in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth? Is it not enough that Sir Henry Tyler, instead of saying they are suffering from the increased cost of coal, owing to the duty, and that it was increased by the amount of the duty, which the ex-Finance Minister made him say, the company are economizing by using more coal and abandoning the use of wood? If the hon. member for Lambton does not think that enough, I am afraid it will be very hard for any one to satisfy him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows it is not enough as well as I do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it will not be necessary to occupy the attention of the House much longer in respect to the question of coal. I think I have disposed once and for ever of any foundation whatever for the imputation that the duty upon coal has increased the cost to the consumer in any part of the whole Dominion. I have shown that whereas poverty and suffering existed before, now all is comfort and prosperity. I have shown hon. gentlemen that the great coal-mining industry, which was languishing and dying, and would have been crushed out, has revived. We would, under the late policy, have been in the position that Ontario would have had no protection, for there would have been no Canadian coal-mines that could have been brought into requisition. But all that

had been changed, and now we found not only industries springing up in every direction, but, at the same time, it can be clearly established that this has been accomplished without either manufacturers or railways or any persons being called upon to pay a single additional farthing. But suppose it had cost the railways something? What have we done for the railways under our policy? Does the hon. gentleman know how those railways have progressed under the National Policy that he and the leader of the Opposition are so exceedingly anxious about—those great corporations which cannot be said to be so very poor? The hon. gentleman has only to look at the returns, and he will find they are of a very striking and interesting character, like all other statistics relating to the National Policy. Those prove beyond controversy the interesting growth, prosperity, advancement and progress of this country. There is no barometer you can apply that will give you a clearer test as to the public weal than the railway receipts of the country. The railways stretch through the country in every direction, and just in proportion as the country flourishes the receipts advance, and as the country suffers they decline. Let me invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to what the railway returns show, and then they will see whether there was any cause for expressing sympathy for the railway companies, even if they paid a coal duty. The following is a comparative statement of the tons of freight carried and of receipts:—

—	1876-77.	1877-78.	1878-79.	1879-80.	1880-81.
Number of tons of freight carried.....	6,859,796	7,883,472	8,348,810	9,938,858	12,102,245
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Receipts from passengers.....	6,458,493	6,386,325	6,459,598	7,076,340	8,198,274
Receipts from freight	11,321,264	13,129,191	12,509,094	15,506,935	18,616,517
Receipts from mails and express.....	744,741	795,797	789,926	851,288	942,671
Receipts from other sources.....	217,554	208,764	166,448	102,076	150,257
	18,742,052	20,520,077	19,925,066	23,536,639	27,907,719

Thus we have a total of \$18,742,052 in 1876-77, against \$19,925,066 in 1878-79; and when the hon. gentleman's policy was changed, we have \$27,907,719 received from rail-

ways in this country, or an increase in 1880-81, from the year the hon. gentleman received permission to retire from the management of public affairs, of no less than \$8,082,453. So that, if the railways had to pay a few cents duty a ton on coal, they could very well afford to pay it, considering the position in which they are placed to-day under the National Policy, compared with that in which they were placed before. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to carry his attention back to the occasion on which he introduced his first Budget Speech. What was the prospect he held out then with reference to the Intercolonial Railway? He led the House to believe that they might be prepared for a deficit of \$1,250,000 in the working of that railway. Well, the year that they retired from the management of public affairs, the deficit went up to nearly \$750,000, and, had the hon. gentleman remained long enough in power, I think he would have been able to prove himself a correct prophet by running the deficit up to the amount he estimated, \$1,250,000. To-day, however, we are able to say that we have increased the carriage of freight 42 per cent., and instead of having to face a deficit of \$750,000, as the account stood in 1878-79, when the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite was changed, we had a small balance it is true, but a balance on the right side of the books. The hon. gentleman may say that we increased freight 42 per cent. So we did, but what effect would that have had if they remained in power? If it had cost as much to carry a ton of freight as when they were in power, the deficits would have enormously increased, and the hon. gentleman would have been able to show triumphantly how accurate he made his estimate when he estimated that it would reach \$1,250,000. Turn which way you like, and what do you find? You find, just as the railroad barometer shows, an enormous increase of traffic, progress, prosperity and comfort, taking the place of poverty and retrogression. That is what you find all over this country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister had the proud satisfaction of standing here, the other night, and presenting a picture of the condition of this country, such as might well fill with just pride the breast of every patriotic Canadian. It did not seem to have quite that effect upon some hon. gentlemen who are not a hundred miles away. One would have supposed he was unfolding a record of the most disastrous woe that could befall a country, if one were to judge from the lengthened visage of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. Perhaps no man ever suffered more than he, while it was his painful duty to see the hon. Finance Minister place in bold relief, though without any allusion to it, the successful results of his policy in

contradistinction to the failure of the policy of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. I need not remind you of the fact that when we adopted our policy, when the issue was joined, when the question was practically for this country whether we should have direct taxation or adopt the National Policy of protecting Canadian industries on Canadian soil. The hon. gentleman smiles when I refer to direct taxation. Does he forget that he himself stood here and admitted that he was at the end of his tether, that all his resources were exhausted, that he knew of no means of wringing any more taxation out of the impoverished people of this country except by direct taxation?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; I did not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman forgets that when a number of the members from Lower Canada were urging a policy that would favor the growth of Canadian tobacco, he met that proposition, not by saying that it was a bad one, but by saying that it would take \$500,000 out of the revenue, and that he knew no mode of replacing it except by direct taxation. The hon. gentleman referred the other night to memories. There is no one thing that he has so much reason to dread as the memory of the members of this House. His Budget Speeches have been fyled away, and have become musty, because no person wishes to turn up such unprofitable and unwholesome reading. If he could only wipe out the recollection of those speeches, and the positions that he assumed when he was feebly attempting to grapple with what he was unable to deal with—the financial interests of this country—it would be, indeed, a fortunate thing for him. We can well recollect when the hon. gentleman brought down his Tariff in 1874 and imposed \$3,000,000 additional taxes, and came back two years later with another deficit, and asked for an additional \$500,000 taxes, he told us we had reached the limit of indirect taxation, and that if he had any convenient mode of collecting an income tax he would be disposed to adopt it. I say that, when the right hon. the leader of the Government came to the rescue, when the people themselves came to the rescue and saved the country from the incompetent hands of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, we stood on the threshold of direct taxation; and if we have it not now it is because these hon. gentlemen were deprived of the position for which they had shown their utter unfitness. But what did they say when our policy was adopted, when we compelled them to admit that we had fairly and faithfully redeemed the pledges on which we had been elected, that we had carried out manfully the assurances we had given the people? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the memories of hon. members

of this House have enabled them to forget that the ground he took was that it would fail as a revenue Tariff?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman forget that he took the ground, on the floor of this Parliament, that the depression would be intensified instead of decreased? Does he forget that for six long months, he and all his followers, in and out of this House, and the *Globe* newspaper, endeavored to show that the depression was deepening, and that the country was irretrievably ruined; and it was only when right and left, before and behind, everywhere in fact, evidence presented itself so overwhelming of the progress and prosperity of the country that it could be no longer concealed, that the hon. gentlemen harked back on their prophecies and tried to discover something besides the National Policy to which our great progress might be attributed? But, Sir, that door is not open to them. It was closed by themselves. Here, on the floor of Parliament, when discussing this great issue of the fiscal policy of Canada, they declared the adoption of the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would fail as a source of revenue, because it would so tax the imports coming into this country that no one could import anything. We tried, in our feeble way, to convince them that they were wrong. We tried to show them that, if we fostered and protected the interests of Canada as they should be, the purchasing power of the people would be increased, and that the imports would increase in a corresponding ratio. Hon. gentlemen had other objections. What were they? They said: "The credit of the country is gone; your policy is such an attack upon Imperial interests that it will close the money market of the world, and your loss of revenue will deprive you still further of the means of paying the indebtedness of the country." That was the hon. gentleman's ground. Where do we stand to-day? When my hon. friend was able to stand up and tell us the revenue had shown such buoyancy, and reached the position it had never shown before, did my hon. friend attempt to show that the credit of the country had suffered? Why, Sir, let me invite the hon. ex-Minister's attention for a few moments to the figures that I have here. If he has any doubt about the credit of the country, they will set his doubts at rest at once and for ever. What did he do when he was entrusted with the power of negotiating the bonds of Canada in the money markets of the world—before he required any money—the hon. gentleman rushed with hot haste into the money market, and by a process to which we shall perhaps

refer more at length by-and-bye, put the securities of Canada on the market—as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance did upon an open market, with free competition, in order that Canada might get what they were worth? No; he fixed the price, he fixed the interest, he fixed the period of the bonds, and fixed the price away below what the bonds were selling for in England at the time on the open market, and what was the result? The result is one that will for ever close that hon. gentleman's mouth on the question of the credit of the country. Who are the happy possessors of the four millions sterling worth of bonds that the hon. gentleman took across the Atlantic, in 1874 and disposed of among his friends—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Who were my friends

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That, Sir, is more than I can tell. The hon. gentleman has refused us that information. If the hon. gentleman is impervious to every kind of evidence, he cannot be impervious to the fact that the men to whom he gave those bonds are, to-day, £600,000 sterling richer than they were before they saw him; that the men to whom he gave the £4,000,000 worth of debentures are, at this moment, the happy possessors of \$2,920,000 more than they paid him for the bonds. I do not wonder the hon. gentleman is getting very uneasy, but there is more to come. What does the hon. gentleman say of 1876? He went back again there when he did not require money, and sold his bonds at a ruinous discount—4 or 5 per cent. below what they were bringing in the market. The happy possessors of those bonds, amounting to £2,500,000 sterling are \$1,825,000 richer than when they purchased those bonds at the price fixed by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance. That, I think, will settle at once and for ever, any question as to the credit of Canada. I do not say that our present position is all due to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I doubt it very much. I do not say it is all due to the National Policy, because had our bonds on that occasion got fair play in the money markets of the world, they would not have been sold at these ruinous figures, however satisfactory the arrangements may be for the happy parties with whom the then Finance Minister made them. Well, Sir, what was my hon. friend the Finance Minister able to show? He was able to show, instead of being in the unhappy position of the ex-Finance Minister, who accumulated a deficit of \$7,500,000 in three years—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I repeat it, Sir. I say, but for the fact that these hon. gentlemen were dismissed from power

by the overwhelming fiat of the great majority of independent electors of this country; but for the fact that the hon. gentleman was deprived of the opportunity of continuing his mad and senseless policy, on July 1st, 1879, he would have had a deficit to face, in the three years, of \$7,500,000. What is the position of the hon. Minister of Finance? He stands in the proud position of being able to show, not only remarkable progress, prosperity, happiness, comfort, and everything that a country can desire to see within its borders, but, under this Tariff, in 1881, a surplus of \$4,139,000; in 1882, a surplus of \$4,450,000, and, in 1883, he has the best reason for estimating an additional \$3,000,000 of surplus. Notwithstanding that he gives back \$1,500,000 taxes to the people, he is able to meet the country with the best evidence that any Finance Minister can desire: that, instead of a deficit of \$7,500,000 in three years, he will have a surplus of \$11,500,000. But, Sir, these hon gentlemen do not like surpluses. When did they discover that a surplus was such a deplorable thing? Why, Sir, we have never ceased to hear them praising the position of the great Republic to the south of us. Do they say a surplus is a bad thing, that it is very bad statesmanship to wipe off the debts of the country by hundreds of millions—\$250,000,000 the year before last was wiped off of the debt of the United States. And yet these hon. gentlemen think a surplus is very bad. Well, Sir, they took the best means to convince the country of their sincerity, for they abhorred a surplus as the greatest pestilence that could invade a country, and they were successful in showing the reverse of a surplus to an extent that would satisfy the most exacting mind. But what more does my hon. friend show? He shows that we have a decreased interest—notwithstanding the great expenditure on the public service of the country—in the year of \$90,000, or an absolute decrease, in the charge on interest, of \$25,000. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has exhibited great anxiety about the indebtedness of Canada. Well, he may thank God and take courage while the management of the financial affairs of the country is in the hands of the present Minister of Finance, because the Minister has shown that we can carry on the public works without increasing the public indebtedness or the charge for interest. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite have been greatly exercised, and have perambulated the country with doleful statements about the enormously increasing expenditure; but we have been able to carry on the public business at an expenditure of actually 23 cents less per capita of the estimated population than the amount expended by hon. gentlemen opposite. But, Sir, I say that the ex-Finance Minister failed, utterly failed, to grapple with this question. It is true he talked here for three hours,

and he talked—I was going to say to very unwilling ears; but I will not, as there were not many ears here to listen to him. Most of them were conspicuous by their absence, and at that I was not at all surprised. After listening to the hon. gentleman for a weary half-hour, and finding him going over and over the same old story that he seems to have got by rote, and is evidently unable to get out of his mind, I was reminded of a witty expression of Lawrence O'Connor Doyle in the Nova Scotia Legislature. There was an exciting discussion there on the subject of pickled fish, and a great deal of acerbity had been thrown into the debate. Presently the debate toned down and it was being carried on in a subdued way, when Larry Doyle rose in his place and said: "We had better take the question for the pickle has run out and there is nothing but tongues and sounds left." Now, for the first hour of the hon. gentleman's speech we had the pickle, but after the pickle ran out we had nothing but tongues and sounds left; and I am sure it was a relief to the House when the hon. gentleman resumed his seat. Well, the hon. Finance Minister has not only done what I have already described, but he is able to show \$1,000,000 of reduction in the controllable expenditure of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to know where the surplus comes from, and they say: "Did not it come out of the people's pockets?" I say in reply, no; \$750,000 come out of the savings in the management of the Intercolonial Railway—the saving of money you wasted before, of money you would waste again if you had the opportunity. The ex-Finance Minister made a point of the Post Office expenditure. But what do the Post Office expenditures show? They show that we spent more money on the Post Office service, and yet that it cost Canada less than it did during the term of office of our predecessors, because, notwithstanding the enormous extension of the service in the North-West and the improvement of facilities generally, the deficiency between our revenue and expenditure is greatly less than when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in charge. The hon. the Finance Minister was also able to show that we could carry our economies into effect when we came into power, an illustration of which was found in the saving of \$671 per mile in the running of the Intercolonial, meaning, in all, a half or three-quarters of a million dollars. He was also in the proud position to show that, notwithstanding the large capital expenditure that has been made, notwithstanding the fact that from the time of the Union until 1878-79 the per capita debt increased from \$29 to \$34—the per capita debt has only been increased \$1 over and above the amount at which it stood when hon. gentlemen opposite

left power. The hon. gentleman was also able to show that, when the great Canadian Pacific Railway is completed, and every dollar of expenditure is provided for, the debt of this country—including the canal expenditure and everything else—would only be \$203,000,000; and that the surpluses—the money the country can afford to pay, as they do in the United States, to the reduction or diminution of the debt—would, up to that period, bring the amount down to \$175,000,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With the sinking fund?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the surpluses, with the sinking fund, would bring it down to \$175,000,000. So I think the anxiety of the leader of the Opposition, on the score of the debt, will be very much relieved. The hon. the Finance Minister also drew attention to the fact—a fact which hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute—that if we sell one-half of the rich, fertile lands we have for sale in the great North-West, at \$1 per acre—and hon. gentlemen opposite are hardly likely to question that calculation—the debt of Canada will be reduced down to \$100,000,000, or to a figure, after the great national work has been provided for, far below what it is at this moment. The hon. gentleman has shown that such was the improved condition of the people that, while these hon. gentlemen are talking about the pressure upon the poor man, and while the hon. gentleman says that the fiscal policy of the country has degraded the poor man, while the hon. gentleman has endeavored to show that his comfort has been less, my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance meets him with conclusive testimony as to the fact that, in three years and four months, these poor suffering operatives have deposited no less than \$13,000,000 in the savings banks of this country; and this, too, notwithstanding the regulation which shut out and closed these savings banks against the wealthier class of the community, and the class of deposits which used to be received. And not only was there an increase of \$13,000,000 in the savings, but also increased deposits in the other banks of no less than \$23,000,000, or an increase of \$36,000,000 in all in money deposited in the banks of Canada in three years and four months; and this is indisputable evidence of the position which this country to-day occupies, notwithstanding the fact which is patent to every hon. gentleman, that, during these three years and four months, more money and more capital has been invested by the capitalists of Canada in fostering, promoting, and building up our industries than ever occurred before in Canada during the same period. The hon. gentleman is, moreover, able to extend the free list; the hon. gentleman is able to take the duties off tea and coffee;

the hon. gentleman is able to meet the desire of our friends in Lower Canada with reference to homegrown tobacco; the hon. gentleman is able to strike off the Stamp duties to the amount of \$200,000 a year; the hon. gentleman is able to give the fishermen of this country a bounty of \$150,000 a year, and well we may do so. What do they do? Why, Sir, these hardy sons of toil, these men who have to take their lives in their hands in building up the industries of the country, have created exports for Canada of no less than \$6,000,000 per annum. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the estimates have been increased. So they have. Naturally they have been increased; and my hon. friend pointed out the reasons why they have not been increased with regard to the controllable expenditure, for that we have decreased—but merely in order that the hon. the Finance Minister might properly discharge his duty to the country. Now, Sir, I think we have given pretty conclusive evidence as to the position which the country occupies. I think that the statements made by my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance will carry the conviction to the mind of every intelligent man in this country, that no country on which the sun shines, was ever in a position to claim greater advance in the progress that has been made in the same time, or was in a happier and more prosperous state than Canada is in to-day. I have had myself the opportunity of seeing more of Canada during the last six months than probably any Canadian ever saw of the country during the same time. I have travelled away up the Pacific coast, and I have gone 300 or 400 miles into the interior of British Columbia, returning through the North-West, Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. I passed through Prince Edward Island from end to end, and with regard to every section of the country which I visited, I am here to add my testimony to that which the hon. Finance Minister gave in such a conclusive manner, and to declare that a more united, a more happy, a more prosperous, and more progressive people are not to be found in any part of the world than are to be found in Canada to-day. This, Sir, is the proud position which my hon. friend occupies; and he was enabled to show that all this enormous increase has been given, and all this change in the trade policy of our country has been accomplished, without exposing ourselves to one jot or tittle of the danger which the ex-Minister of Finance predicted when this policy was introduced. It was said it was going to be inimical to Great Britain. But, Sir, the fact is now ascertained from the Trade Returns that, so far from this being the case, the very reverse has been the result. Instead of a policy, such as was in operation before, and which was eminently in the

interest of our friends across the border, when no Canadian could look forward to any future, except the hope that he might continue to occupy the position to which we were reduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, of being the hewers of wood and drawers of water to our neighbors across the line, and instead of the trade of Canada being steadily withdrawn from Great Britain to whom we owe so much, and transferred to the foreign country to the south of us, building up that great and populous Republic, the result has been what my hon. friend said it would be, and the Trade Returns establish the fact that the average imports from the Mother Country are increased, while the average imports from the Republic to the south of us have been largely decreased. My hon. friend, moreover, has been able to show that not only is this the case, but also without increasing the price of all those products and articles which, owing to the high prices, were going to cause so much suffering and destitution throughout the country provided this policy was adopted. Competition between our home industries has been such that we occupy the vantage ground of being able to demonstrate that never were necessities of life and the things which are incidental to the comfort and happiness of the poor man to be obtained in Canada at a cheaper rate than is now the case. And the hon. gentleman did not venture to question this.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I did so, very strongly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman merely said that: "Assuming it to be true, the question was not whether all these articles were to-day cheaper than they were in 1878 in Canada under my Tariff, but whether we can buy them cheaper to-day in Canada than in New York," and if so, he says: "You are injuring the poor man." Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he must be hard-pressed, when he is endeavoring to controvert the fiscal policy which is calculated to foster and protect the industries of Canada, and can only say, that the way in which the poor man is injured, is not because we have not reduced the cost of goods below what they were in 1878, under his Tariff, but because prices are not as low as they are in a country where the Tariff is twice as high as ours. But let the hon. gentleman take courage and take heart. If, in a country where the duties imposed are doubly as heavy as they are in this country, you can buy cheaper, and if, under our policy, you can buy goods cheaper than was the case under his Tariff in 1878,

how long will it be before you can get goods in Canada at prices greatly below those now paid for them? And the hon. gentleman will find that, while the Treasury is six millions better off, there is no industry in this country which is also not better off. He said—and I was not surprised to hear it—that he labored under very great difficulties in getting up a case against this policy. He says: "I cannot get the farmers to give me any information." The farmers are so rich and happy, and contented, and comfortable, that they would not talk to, or look at, the hon. the ex-Finance Minister at all, and I am not surprised at it. He says that the farmers were deceived. Sir, there is not a class of our people more difficult to deceive than our farmers. It is because he could not deceive the farmers of this country that the hon. gentleman is sitting where he is now. They felt that, under the hon. gentleman's policy, they did not get fair play in Canada, and they exercised their independent influence at the polls to place the hon. gentleman where he is, and to bring back into power the party who said they were determined to foster and protect and maintain Canadian industries on Canadian soil. Well, Sir, what else was my hon. friend able to show? These hon. gentlemen were very anxious about the amount paid to Sir Alexander Galt a little while ago. They said it was a terrible thing to have a High Commissioner, and consequently I was glad to learn, from the remarks made on the opening day of the Session, that the hon. leader of the Opposition had changed his mind on this point, and suggested that Canada had attained to so dignified a position that she ought to have a Minister at every civilized court in the world. But, Sir, Sir Alexander Galt, in conjunction with the Minister of Finance and the leader of the Government, have effected a financial arrangement, and what does it save? Why, Sir, we save \$15,000 a year in the payments which we are now required to make to Messrs. Glyn and Baring, under the system which was under operation when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of office; and not only that, but when \$35,000,000 are to be redeemed in 1885, the country will save in this one transaction, under this new arrangement, no less than \$350,000. I, therefore, say that if ever there was a Finance Minister who had reason to be satisfied, and who was able to point to every industry in the country, and show that new life and vitality were given to it, and to the position of every artisan and operative in this country, and demonstrate that his position was immensely improved over what it was before, it is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The ex-Minister of Finance wants to know what we have done for the workingmen. I have shown what we have done for the shipbuilders; I have shown what we

have done for the miner, and I have shown what we have done for the farmer, and the fisherman. It has been shown that the prices of farmer's products have been better than ever before, and the hon. gentleman opposite (the ex-Finance Minister) impaled himself on the horns of this dilemma the other night. He said you cannot improve the price of wheat because that is regulated in Mark Lane; and yet the hon. gentleman denounced the tax in breadstuffs, including wheat, as an odious tax. I want him to establish the assertion that it is an odious tax, and that under the National Policy there is no improvement in the price of the products of the farm. Let me ask him this question: he says we have increased the farmers' burdens, and he has gone before the farmer with tears in his eyes to condemn our policy with this result: that the farmers have simply laughed at him. They have laughed at him because they knew what he had said here before, and would say here again if in power as he said the other night, that the laborer's burdens had been increased by the price of living—that everything he used he had to pay more for it. How can you increase the cost of everything consumed by the laborer, mainly consisting of farm products, without benefitting the farmer? It is just such questions we had put to him. We told him we would benefit all classes of industries in the country. We told him we would improve the condition of the farmer by a better home market. But the hon. gentleman could not understand. But now when the farmer laughs at him on account of his theories, he will know that the people hold that his former statements were baseless; that the farmer to-day gets more for every product, that is more for every product of the soil than he could have got if the policy of the late Government, of making Canadians hewers of wood and drawers of water for any other country, had been carried out as he would still have carried it out.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will become my duty to make a few further observations in relation to the remarks made by the ex-Finance Minister in reply to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on Friday evening last. But before I do so I have a still more painful task to perform, of referring to the mode in which the hon. gentleman replied to my hon. friend the Finance Minister. I am in the judgment of the House when I say that the gratuitous and unprovoked insult offered to my hon. friend who propounded the policy of the Government in the Budget Speech, excited the common disgust of both

sides of the House. I say it to the credit of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who I believe felt acutely the insult offered to my hon. friend, and the still greater insult offered to the dignity of Parliament, as the hon. gentlemen of this side of the House. My hon. friend the Finance Minister at a very early age engaged in commercial pursuits, and having, by industry, by integrity, by everything that men value, attained the confidence of all classes of the community in which he lived, he had the honor at a very early age to be elected the representative of the chief city of the Province of New Brunswick. That hon. gentleman so discharged his duty as to be elevated to the high and honorable position of Prime Minister of that Province, and he came to this Parliament in 1867 enjoying the respect of all classes of the Province in which he was born. In this great arena he was able to take such a high position as warranted his being advanced to the elevated position he now occupies, and, at a later period, he entered upon the highest social position in New Brunswick, amid the hearty applause of both sides in that Province, who vied with each other in terms of friendly reception upon its being announced that he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. The colleagues of the hon. gentleman opposite in public declared that had they had the selection of a gentleman to fill that high office, there was no man they would have rather asked to occupy that position than my hon. friend. Well, at the close of his period of office as Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, he was invited by hon. gentlemen opposite to accept a second term.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No, he was not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would require better authority of contradiction than the ex-Finance Minister enjoys in this House or out of it, to cast doubt on my statement. I say again that the colleagues of the ex-Finance Minister, when he was Finance Minister, approached my hon. friend to induce him to accept the second term of the Governorship of that Province at their hands. What did he do? Why it was a position of ease; it was a position worthy of any gentleman in this House, or out of it, to occupy. But he looked at his country, and saw the condition of public affairs; he saw the prostration of this country; he saw the lamentable position to which his successor had brought the financial affairs of the country; and, regardless of his own ease and comfort, he threw himself back into the political field and was again sent to this Parliament by the chief city of New Brunswick. Well, having been clothed with the important duties he now

discharges, he returned to that constituency, and, by acclamation, was again sent back here to deal with the public affairs of Canada. How has he dealt with them? Handling the most important questions that could be confided to any member of any administration, at a time the most critical in the history in Canada, he has been so enabled to deal with those great questions as to empower him to stand in the proud and triumphant position he now occupies, and to show the House that no Government in the country, or out of it, ever occupied a position more triumphant in relation to the questions of public policy which he has propounded. And, Sir, that speech, one which I need not say to the hon. gentlemen who heard it, was of transcendent ability—a speech that would have done honor to any representative assembly in the world—that speech, I say, the courtesy of which only equalled the ability with which it was delivered, was received by the ex-Finance Minister—how? Why, Sir, in a manner that, I have no hesitation in saying, caused his supporters and the hon. gentlemen who sit around him, to blush with shame.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Sir, suppose that, instead of the record that my hon. friend possesses; suppose that he had stood in this House in the position of a man who, unable to make his own way, born in the lap of luxury, had had all the advantage that wealth can bestow, and had been sent to a great University on the other side of the water; and suppose that he had come back without the honors and distinction that such a man, if there was anything in him, ought to have come back with, had come back without either honor or distinction; supposing that having returned he had undertaken to qualify himself to practice in a learned profession, and after years of struggling was obliged to abandon it because he was not able to reach the Bar, and suppose, making use of his wealth, he had been able to obtain a constituency, and finding that the party with which he was associated knew him too well to entrust him with high and responsible duties, he had abandoned his party, turned his back upon his friends and went over to the enemy and made common cause with them, and by his political tergiversation obtained a position amongst his opponents of a life time that he had never been able to acquire among his friends; suppose that had been the position of my hon. friend, and suppose that having obtained the lofty position of Minister of Finance, instead of discharging the high duties that devolved upon him in the way my hon. friend has done, his first act was to put into the mouth of the Governor General a statement that was devoid of truth——

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose that for political and party purposes he had asked the representative of Her Majesty in Parliament assembled to declare that the financial condition of this country was such from the inability of the revenue to meet the expenditure, that a serious deficit was inevitable—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That a serious deficit would follow unless increased taxation was laid upon the shoulders of the people—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose that after that hon. gentleman had ventured to make that statement, he had supported it, by attempting to force a balance in the Public Accounts, to the extent of half a million of money; suppose that my hon. friend stood convicted—and I use the term deliberately—stood convicted before this Parliament, of having put chargeable to revenue \$545,000 that was voted by Parliament for capital account, spent by Government for capital account, was transferred by the late Finance Minister to force a balance on the other side; suppose that after all that was done my hon. friend had been unable to accomplish his object, and that it had remained clear as noon day that after this half million had been carried over, he still stood in the position of having a proved and established surplus at the time he had declared there would be a deficit; suppose that would be the position—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I deny every word of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does he deny having declared that the ordinary expenditure of the country demanded a large increase in the volume of taxation to be put upon the people of this country? I have, under my hand here, the hon. gentleman's own testimony, and there was not a word of truth in it. The same hon. gentleman that declared that there would have been \$1,500,000 deficit on the 1st July, 1874, the same hon. gentleman that declared that, in 1875, the ordinary expenditure of the country would have involved a deficit of \$2,000,000, committed himself to this statement which I will read, and then I will leave the House to judge how far that hon. gentleman's statement will be regarded as a contradiction to any statement that any hon. gentleman may make in this House. I read from an Order in Council. What does it say? That that \$3,000,000 of taxes was imposed to meet a deficit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. You should say, were imposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much obliged to my hon. friend. I am afraid I shall be charged with being ungrammatical. Does it say those \$3,000,000 of taxes were imposed for the purpose of meeting a prospective deficit in the ordinary expenditure? No, Sir, but the hon. gentleman here stands committed, with every colleague that he had in the Government, to the statement that every dollar of that was imposed for another and a different purpose, and that was to meet the expenditure that would be involved by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will read from an Order in Council, to the truth of which every one of those gentlemen is pledged, of the 8th July, 1874, after the close of this very year in which the hon. gentleman declared that it was necessary to impose high additional taxation in order to enable the revenue to cover the expenditure. On that day, this Minute of Council is signed and sent to the same Governor General that had been asked to declare, in his place in Parliament, that a large taxation was required to meet the ordinary expenditure of the country. It says:

"In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposals which it was hoped British Columbia would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised, at the late Session, about 15 per cent.; Customs duties being raised from 15 to 17½ per cent., and the Excise duties on spirits and tobacco, a corresponding rate, both involving additional taxation exceeding \$3,000,000 in the transactions of the year."

Now, the hon. gentleman ventured the statement that this taxation was required to meet an impending deficit, and yet he declares that more than \$3,000,000—\$3,000,000 was all he asked the House to vote for the purpose he then stated—that more than \$3,000,000 was voted by this Parliament for the express purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; it is no such thing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, suppose that my hon. friend, after placing himself in that position, had gone a step further, and suppose he had been entrusted with the public debentures of the country for the purpose of floating a loan in the Imperial market, and suppose my hon. friend, instead of placing the debentures of Canada in the most favorable position he could, and by public competition obtaining the very highest price they would command, and bringing back to this country \$500,000 more than the hon. gentleman obtained for a like amount of debentures.—I say, suppose, instead of doing that, he had gone there and quietly sat down and fixed a price, below the market rate, and had sold these debentures to parties who, as I have stated before on the two occasions on which

the hon. gentleman made this secret loan he had sold them to his friends, and had enabled them to stand in the position to-day of being richer to the extent of \$4,745,000, than they would have been had they not made the hon. gentleman's acquaintance——

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, I say if my hon. friend, instead of occupying the position he occupies in this House and country, had his reputation tarnished with transactions such as this——

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that then there might have been some excuse for the arrogant and insolent tone which the hon. gentleman ventured to use toward my hon. friend. Now, he holds that the Speaker of the Senate, my hon. friend's colleague, is a very high authority, and he quoted him the other night as a great authority, as if the opinion of the Speaker of the Senate was to be accepted as conclusive, and he puts him in the *Hansard* as having settled that question by his *ipse dixit*. Now, Sir, I will quote the authority to which he pays such deference, and I will see what that hon. gentleman, known to the members of this House and the country at large as a man of the highest standing and character—known to be a man thoroughly versed in all these banking, mercantile and monetary transactions—has to say of the ex-Minister of Finance, and we will see whether that hon. gentleman is as ready to accept the authority of the hon. Speaker of the Senate as he was when he quoted him against me the other night:

"In the increase of the debt stated above, \$42,811,202.32, of course is included the sum of \$1,520,833, that being substantially the portion of the loan of 1876 (\$12,166,666) which Sir Richard Cartwright allowed as discount to the lenders, and paid for brokerage, &c."

I may say that my hon. friend, the Speaker of the Senate, in using this language, is only dealing with the smaller loan of £2,500,000 sterling, and not with the larger loan of £4,000,000, which was still worse. He goes on:

"While the Dominion did not receive this sum of \$1,520,833, or any part of it, yet interest, sinking fund, &c., have to be paid thereon, amounting to about \$70,000 a year, till the maturity of the loan in 1906. (The interest alone at 4 per cent. exceeds \$60,000 a year). To have to pay \$70,000 a year for 30 years for that which the Dominion did not receive, seems a grievous hardship, but Sir Richard maintains that it was a model loan."

An hon. MEMBER. A muddled loan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, perhaps it is a misprint for that. He goes on to say:

"But, in the opinion of men who do not belong to their model school of finance, it was an improvident and mysterious loan."

Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what a mysterious loan is?

"I say mysterious, because it was sold without competition, on terms which reduced the net proceeds which Canada received to about 87½ cents on the dollar, and, further, because Mr. Mackenzie's Administration refused to make public the names of the allottees or beneficiaries."

And now we find that the allottees or beneficiaries are only a trifle under one million pounds sterling better off for these two loans, which they negotiated with the hon. the ex-Finance Minister of the Dominion. Now, suppose my hon. friend stood in that position, there might be some slight ground, some show of reason, why any hon. gentleman in this House might feel that he need not be too choicé in the language he was throwing across the floor when dealing with such a man and under such circumstances. But, I say, Sir, and I say it advisedly, that there is not a man in Canada who has the bad eminence that the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance has, as one who has lowered the tone of debate in this House and out of it, without the slightest cause; there is not a man in Canada, and I say it advisedly, who has placed himself in a position of more unenviable notoriety than has that hon. gentleman by the coarse, insulting and ungentlemanly language which he uses in this House and out of it, and I will prove the truth of what I say. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman is not particular to a shade as to the occasion on which he uses such language. What would he have thought of my hon. friend if he had gone to London and over his own signature committed himself solemnly to the statement that all the expenditure which the Government of this country had undertaken was wise and legitimate expenditure—an expenditure in the public interest; that it had all been admirably calculated to promote the best interests of Canada, and had then come back with the ink barely dry on this record, on the solemn record to which he had committed himself, had gone on a public platform and denounced the men who had incurred that expenditure, which he solemnly declared was a wise and judicious expenditure, and one which was in the interests of the country?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a bit? Then I shall read the hon. gentleman's own language, for I have it here:

"This entire debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. But not wisely or judiciously.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not done with the hon. gentleman yet :

"The indirect advantage from these public works has been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed. The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since Confederation."

Now, what will be said of a gentleman, who having signed this with his own hand as the Finance Minister of Canada, stating to the people of England that they could rely on that as being an honest and a true statement of the affairs of this country—what shall be said of him when he comes back to Canada, and on a public platform uses the foul language that the men who incurred that expenditure had exhibited brutal ignorance, or that their conduct was that of a drunken crew scuttling the ship they were about to leave? And what was his excuse when he was charged with such conduct as I have described? He says that the exigencies of a public man are very great.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I said nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He said that sometimes we have to exhibit a silver shield and sometimes a brazen one. I think most of the hon. members of this House, who have heard the hon. gentleman, will have come to the conclusion that he mostly relies on the brazen shield, for a more brazen transaction or a transaction which, to use the words which he is so ready to use himself, stamps the man who was guilty of it with undying ignominy in the eyes of every honorable and high-minded man, was never perpetrated in this country. And what does the hon. gentleman venture to say in the very speech which he delivered the other evening? He says that the statements of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture—his published official statements—are utterly unreliable. And what more does he venture to say of a man who, he knows, stands as high as a man of honor and character in this House as any man that can be found in the wide domain of Canada? He uses the term in reference to the conduct of that gentleman—"deliberate and fraudulent intent." What shall be said of a man who ventures to use such language as that, of any hon. gentleman of this House, and especially by a man who has such a record as the hon. gentleman himself? What shall be said of a man who applies to a Minister of the Crown, my right hon. friend who sits beside me (Sir John A. Macdonald), such language as that he was "insolent and unscrupulous," or applies to him the

term "deserved ignominy?" He said that the right hon. gentleman was driven from power in deserved ignominy.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no man in this House who should blush more to make such a statement than the hon. gentleman. What did he do? He spent five long years standing in the position of a Minister of the Crown, denouncing my right hon. friend in the foulest and most unworthy terms that our language supplies. He went from platform to platform outside of this House, and fairly out-Heroded Herod in relation to the language he used inside the House; and with what result? With the result that when the great electorate—the great, independent, intelligent electorate of Canada—were called upon to decide between my right hon. friend and the man who traduced him, they consigned one to the ignominy which he deserved, and gave to the other the highest and proudest position that a Prime Minister of Canada ever occupied. If the hon. gentleman was capable of learning anything—which I regret to say, I find he is too obtuse to do—he would have learned that his declarations of opinion are utterly discredited by the people of Canada. He would have learned, Sir, that he had it thrown back in his teeth that all the foul language he had used had recoiled upon his own head, and that he had sunk, while my hon. friend had become elevated to the proud position he now occupies. If only for its uselessness, one would suppose that he would have learned by this time the folly of giving vent to such utterances. The hon. gentleman says—and it is a very striking illustration of the bent of his mind—that it may be all very well for the Minister of Finance to place under obligation these millionaires, that the money may be found very convenient at times of a general election. That shows the bent of the the hon. gentleman's mind. Suppose, Sir, that my hon. friend had stood convicted, as that hon. gentleman stands convicted—and I use the term again advisedly—of having in the teeth of the statute abused his position in the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs, by taking surreptitiously from the public Treasury \$59,000 before a general election, and giving it to a great corporation. Is it any wonder, Sir, that men should come to the conclusion that Ministers of the Crown may forget the high position they occupy to such an extent as to become the beneficiaries—not to the tune of \$5,000,000 to friends abroad, but here in Canada, to lay a great corporation under the obligation of having received, in the teeth of the statute, \$59,000 of public money. Now, Sir, I am glad that the painful task of showing that hon. gentleman what my hon. friend has not

done—what his record is not—is ended, and that the insult, the gross, unpardonable insult flung across the House by the hon. gentleman, was as undeserved as it was gratuitous; and, Sir, I will now pass on to notice a few more of the very remarkable observations made by the hon. gentleman in reply to my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman, with his very stilted phraseology, and his wheeling around and throwing himself into a great variety of attitudes, brought to my recollection a circumstance that occurred on the occasion of his first Budget Speech. I confess that the hon. gentleman has improved a little in his style of public address since then. There were some comments in the lobby on that occasion; and, as you will remember, the hon. gentleman was not only very stilted, but very mechanical; and one gentleman said to another in the lobby: "He seemed to bounce around and jerk around like one of Mitchell's revolving lighthouses." "Yes," said the other, "but without the light." When I saw the hon. gentleman wheeling around to his supporters, it reminded me of that occasion; and when I tried to follow him, I saw that the hon. gentleman had no argument to address to the House, and I found that it was the revolving lighthouse without the light. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the outset, took my hon. friend to task for want of economy in preparing his estimates. Want of economy in preparing his estimates! What did the hon. gentleman mean? Does he forget that the estimated expenditures of the first year that he was Finance Minister are now recorded on the public records of this country, and that he asked this Parliament to vote no less than \$26,600,000? And yet, in the year 1882, he wants to know why his economy was not followed. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman asked for no less than \$44,300,000 more than the largest expenditure that Canada had ever had. I know that the Public Accounts state that the expenditure of 1873-74 was \$23,316,316; but it is not true. That is the statement in which the hon. gentleman forced the balance. That is the statement which contains half a million of money, transferred by the hon. gentleman's right hand from capital account to the charges on revenue, contrary to the manner in which it was voted by Parliament, for the purpose of swelling the balance and making the excuse for his statement that there would be a deficit on the first of the following July. And that matter, Sir, stands on record, under the pen of one of the officers in the hon. gentleman's own Department, the accountant. And what else? There are \$59,000 of Customs refunds of the former year, and, if that had been an honest charge, it could not have gone in there as an expenditure of that year, which the hon. gentleman knows right well. It was a statement of an amount of money

drawn in the teeth of the statute out of the Treasury of Canada, and handed over to a wealthy corporation on the eve of an election, and the hon. gentleman seems to understand all the weight and importance of such a transaction as that. Well, Sir, the next fault he has to find with my hon. friend, is this—he wants to know if being two or three million dollars astray in the estimated revenue he is to receive is not evidence of the want of ability in the hon. the Finance Minister. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says my hon. friend took a leap in the dark. Well, he came out the right side up. The hon. gentleman took a leap in the dark, but he came out in the ditch—that is the difference. My hon. friend knows that it would be impossible—not in the case of an ordinary change, but in a revolution in the Tariff, such as was the change my hon. friend made—to estimate exactly what he would receive. But he came out with the balance on the right side—he came out with a surplus. The hon. gentleman took his leap in the dark, and he came out, at the end of three years, with a deficit of \$7,500,000. That is the difference. The hon. gentleman talks about leaps in the dark. Why, the hon. gentleman, with the Tariff, and with the Trade Returns in his hands, and with the experience of the past, brought down his Estimates here—and what were they? His estimated expenditure was \$26,600,000, and he was only \$2,987,000 astray. The hon. gentleman declared that he would receive from that Tariff of his own concoction \$25,250,000, and he received \$22,507,000, or \$2,642,000 less. And yet he stands up here, with the brazen shield as usual, and taunts my hon. friend with errors in his estimate, and with having got more money by his leap in the dark than he expected. The hon. gentleman's next charge is that the expenditure had swollen double—from \$13,500,000 to \$26,600,000. Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to say to that? The expenditure had swollen from \$13,500,000 to \$23,500,000 at the time the hon. gentleman came into power, according to his own statement on Friday night. Yet, what was his first step? Did he say that was enough for him? Big as it was swollen it was too small for him. Big as it was swollen his first step was to come down and ask the House for \$3,000,000 more in order to carry on the ordinary expenditure of the country. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman would act wisely if he said little about it. He declared in England that the increased expenditure was of such a character that it had greatly advanced the best interests of the Dominion, yet the hon. gentleman now declared that such increase was unnecessary; because if it does not mean that it means nothing, for if the increase was necessary for public purposes, then the Minister of Finance

would not be justified, if he failed to bring down such estimates to Parliament; if, on the other hand, they were beyond what they should have been, then the Finance Minister should defend himself for coming to Parliament in 1874 and asking for \$26,600,000. The hon. gentleman's first estimate was only \$400,000 less than the statement now on the Table of the House; yet he charges us with extravagance. I now desire to direct the attention of the House to a very important statement made by the hon. member on Friday night. He said:

"Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota, and other portions of the United States."

Who is to blame for that? The hon. gentleman bows his head: he is. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is quite conscious who is to blame.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. You are to blame.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will show the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. I will direct attention, while on this point, to another remark made by the hon. gentleman, as it relates to the same subject. He said:

"If ever an impudent assertion was made on the floor of this House, if ever there was a case of effrontery in this world, it was when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and dared to say that the Opposition were responsible for the fact that so many Canadians had gone to Minnesota and Dakota, in place of going to the Canadian North-West."

I am in the judgment of the House as to whether hon. gentlemen opposite for years have not been decrying and denouncing everything Canadian.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the judgment of the House, of both sides of it, as to whether those hon. gentlemen have not, both in their places in Parliament and on the public platform, done all that men could do to cause men to turn their backs on Canada and take up their residence in the United States. I will read a statement made by the ex-Finance Minister, and if he can find any advertisement published in the United States more calculated to draw people from Canada to that country, where the hon. gentleman is not known but only has the reputation of having been a Finance Minister, then I should like to see it. What did the hon. gentleman say here in his place in Parliament on Friday night? He ventured to use such language as this with respect to his country:

"Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other."

Is that calculated to draw immigrants to Canada. That is the language that he and his friends have used in expressing their opinions of this country. I say there is no intelligent man who places confidence in, or believes in the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, who would not turn his back at the first opportunity on this country and remove to any other country in the world. That is the position which the hon. gentleman occupies, and that is the kind of work that he and those around him have been engaged in doing for years in the interest of Canada. Despite all their efforts, they have worked in vain. Under the financial policy of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, enacted into law by Parliament, all the efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite have proved to be futile, and to have only recoiled on themselves, and they will only have the result of teaching an intelligent people, keenly alive to their own interests, who are the men in this country upon whose statements they may place reliance, and who are the men upon whose management of public affairs they may wisely depend. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman entertained us with his novel theory respecting the balance of trade. We have been accustomed to hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the United States and the statesmen of that great country, who have proved themselves to be about as successful in the management of financial affairs as those of any country in the world. I know of no instance in which the financial management of the Government has been crowned with such remarkable results as in the United States. What did President Grant say on the question of balance of trade? Did he say that the more the balance of trade was against the United States the better? President Grant, in his Message of the 6th of December, 1876, said:

"Taxes have been reduced, within the last seven years, nearly three hundred millions of dollars, and the National Debt has been reduced, in the same time, over four hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars. By refunding the six per cent. bonded debt for bonds bearing 5 and $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, respectively, the annual interest has been reduced from over one hundred and thirty millions of dollars, in 1869, to but little over one hundred millions of dollars in 1876."

President Grant then adds the boast that the balance of trade has been changed from \$130,000,000 against the United States in 1869, to \$120,000,000 in their favor in 1876. The hon. gentleman says that it is perfectly obvious, if you send \$60,000 or \$70,000 away and receive back \$90,000, you make money by the exchange. He forgets that the balance has to be paid in gold. I need not say, with respect to England, that no comparison can be drawn, because it is the great money centre of the world, and occupies an entirely different position from

countries generally. The hon. gentleman says we have increased the cost of living, and gives the reason "that on every yard of coarse tweed the poor man uses, the Tariff compels him to pay 25 or 30 or 40 per cent. and perhaps more, than in 1878." Well, did the hon. gentleman not notice the statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister with respect to the wool trade of this country; did he fail to perceive that the amount of wool increased was reduced and a less quantity exported, while, at the same time, a greater quantity was used in this country, and the consumption of wool was increased by nearly 3,000,000 lbs. during the year? What does that mean? Why, it means that the wise policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance gives such encouragement to the manufacture of these coarser cloths which the poor men require, that the amount of wool consumed in their manufacture is 3,000,000 lbs. over and above that of any previous year. That ought to be an explanation to the hon. gentleman, that it is quite possible for a tariff to be so constructed, in relation to the industries of a country, as to foster the manufacture of these articles within the country, so as, by competition, to furnish the people with them, as my hon. friend showed they had been furnished, at a lower cost, while giving profitable employment to our operatives and consuming the wool grown in the country. The hon. gentleman is very anxious about the lumberman; he wants to know why we do not give the lumberman a bounty. I have passed over a great deal of what the hon. gentleman said, because it seems to require no remark. There may be a point in it, but his sentences are so involved that it is difficult to discover any point. He wants to know if the fisherman has bounties why not the lumberman as well. Yet the lumber trade, according to his own showing, was never in a more flourishing condition than it is to-day, and the hon. gentleman will find it as difficult to get information from the lumbermen as from the farmers. The reason is, they have no such information to give as he is looking for. There is a lumberman behind me of high standing and character who is as well acquainted with the lumber trade as any man in the country. Let the hon. gentleman look at his books and he will find no cause of complaint. He will find that the lumbermen are suffering from no reverse. On the contrary, so flourishing has been the lumber trade in the past year that \$12,000,000 worth were actually exported over the previous year. As for the farmers, he has admitted that they are so prosperous, owing to the prices of everything they raise that it is quite unnecessary to refer to them. That hon. gentleman must have another personal fling at my hon. friend. He is very anxious there should be no nepotism in

this country, that Ministers of the Crown should show an utter disregard of their own relatives, that when they make friends they should make them abroad. That when they wanted support of the great companies that was all right, but no Minister of the Crown should pay any attention to his own connections. I think, if the hon. gentleman would look into the Public Accounts, he will find a few pensioners of his own name and connections entered in them. It is, therefore, not very safe for him to sling a stone in that direction. He complains also of the mode in which the Civil Service has been dealt with in making improper promotions. I ask the hon. gentleman to take up the record of this Government and find one case analogous to the mode in which promotion was abused and the introduction of parties into the public service abused under his Government. Let him refer to the Post Office Department, and he will find the case of a stranger, not belonging to the country at all, who was brought in and appointed over the heads of civil servants, men of character, standing and intelligence, and able to teach that gentleman his duty. Yet this stranger was forced in over their heads at a salary which they could not acquire after twenty years service. Let the hon. gentleman then go to the Customs Department, and he will find that for a supporter of one of his hon. colleagues the same operation was performed; and gentlemen who had served long years in the public service were taught the melancholy lesson that no matter how well they performed their duties they were to remain in the back ground whenever a Minister had a friend or favorite to push over their heads. In the Public Works Department a still more flagrant and notorious instance of political favoritism occurred. A man brought in from the outside was pushed from pillar to post until he was landed, after three or four years service, in the position of Deputy Minister, when those hon. gentlemen went out of power. When the hon. gentleman finds three cases under this Administration to compare with those I have mentioned, he may fairly venture to throw his taunts across the floor of this House at the mode in which promotions are made under this Government. The hon. gentleman taunted my hon. friend with having framed a Tariff most disastrous to the shipbuilding industry. Where did the hon. gentleman get his authority? Does he not know that there has been a keen competition going on between iron and wooden ships, in which the latter have been worsted? Does he not know that all he could do himself to strike down the shipbuilding industry he did; and that although we did succeed in staying his arm to some extent, it was not until we came back to power, that, by our giving a drawback to the extent of the duty imposed on the materi-

als used in shipbuilding, that industry had any fair play. Let me read the hon. gentleman a statement from the *Windsor Mail*, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia. That statement reads:

"During the year just closed Hants County built twenty-six vessels measuring 19,944 tons. Never but once in the history of the county was there such a large amount of shipping built as during the past year. The total number of vessels on our list is 252, measuring 163,144 tons. More than half of these are barques and ships, nearly all of which are engaged in the foreign trade. The amount of capital invested in this country during the past year alone is not far short of \$600,000, and the total value of the shipping of the county amounts to considerably over \$4,000,000. There was built last year in this county nearly one ton of shipping for every inhabitant, and the total amount of shipping on the list would average seven tons for every man, woman and child in the county."

Yet the hon. gentleman says the shipbuilding industry is suffering. He wants to know why we are going to relieve the fishermen. He cannot get this bounty for the fishermen out of his mind. It seems to disturb the hon. gentleman. But I can tell him there will be no such difficulty with the poor and hardy fishermen. They will not whine over this bounty as the hon. gentleman is inclined to do. He says the Minister of Finance proposes to relieve the fishermen of his native Province and of the Maritime Provinces. But what is he going to do with all these numerous classes of people such as clergymen, schoolmasters, clerks and others, whose income is to a certain extent fixed? Let him go to any clergyman, and he will find the same difficulty as to the information he wants as he finds with the farmers. But, Sir, the clergyman will tell him that, under this fiscal policy, the congregation that was struggling, unable to do as they wished to do, to sustain the church to which they belonged, have now ample means to give their clergyman the comforts he and his family requires. When he goes to the schoolmaster, the schoolmaster will tell him: "Why, Sir, you have mistaken me if you think I am an object of sympathy. The number of children who can be sent to school now--whose parents formerly were struggling with poverty, unable to clothe them--is such as to give me ample reward." The demand for teachers, like the demand for knowledge, like the demand for luxuries, has grown just as the revenue of the country has grown, grown just as the industries have grown, and just as everything that is in the interest of Canada has grown from the time the hon. gentleman was deprived of the power of longer throwing his blight over all the industries of this country from end to end. In the matter of clerks, before, while the hon. gentleman was in power every third man you met wanted to know if you could not give him some little office that would give him \$200 or \$300

a year. He would say, I am an accomplished accountant, a good writer, and have a thorough knowledge of grammar, which the hon. ex-Finance Minister honors so highly, but I can get no employment. If you want a man possessing those attainments to-day you have to search for him, because the demand for that kind of labor, created by the industries that have grown up, has made it almost impossible to get such men who previously searched in vain for employment. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a very remarkable admission the other day. He said: "I feel much more disposed to blush for the degradation of Canada"—that is the language with which the hon. gentleman invites people to come to this country—"and to tremble for the consequences hereafter." Sir, I do not wonder the hon. gentleman trembles. I should be greatly surprised to see him blush. He is much more in the brazen shield line than in the blushing line. What is the dread hereafter he trembles to meet? It is the next election, Sir. I am told already, that not only is there a revolt among the hon. gentleman's supporters in this House—and I am not surprised that they should be anxious for him to relinquish the position of financial spokesman of the party—but that his constituents are equally willing to let him make his bow and give them an opportunity of being better represented. I am not surprised that the outlook in his old constituency, where he is best known and from which he was dismissed by the verdict of the people at the last election—notwithstanding his boasted wealth he was compelled to abandon that constituency, and he trembles now lest he may not find it easy to get back into the House at all. The hon. gentleman may find the electors of this country share the sentiment he uttered the other night, that a Minister—and, of course, he who aims at being a Minister—should be like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. The hon. gentleman told us that he prays sometimes. Let me recommend him when he does so to use that model and best of prayers in which he will find: "Lead us not into temptation;" a prayer that he may never again be Finance Minister, and never have the chance of repeating his operation on the money markets of the world. That is a prayer in which the intelligent electors of this country will most devoutly join. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman concluded his somewhat vague and stilted address with the following statement:—

"For those men may boast of their great majority here to-day, they may boast of their full Treasury, they may boast of their devoted supporters, but I can recollect some ten years ago when these gentlemen were just as insolent, just as arrogant as they are to-day, when they had just as strong a majority behind them, just as full a Treasury, when they were prepared to be just as unscrupulous in maintaining their places as they are to-day, yet in twelve months after that time I saw

them scattered and driven into deserved ignominy. The fate that befel them in 1873 may well befall them in 1883, and I see signs and tokens, not a few, that if they do not take care, and if they do not mend their ways, that fate will assuredly befall them again."

Sir, does the hon. gentleman not see that, just in proportion as he can sustain the charge of our being dismissed from power with deserved ignominy, he is heaping a greater amount of it upon himself. Does the hon. gentleman not see that it is bad enough for a party, strong in power, with a great majority in this House behind them, as they had in 1878, to go to the people against a high-minded honorable set of gentlemen on the other side, and sustain an overwhelming defeat? But, Sir, what shall be said of men who, after the people of this country have had an opportunity of weighing them in the balance, say of them: "For heaven's sake give us back anything rather than let them again have control of the Government." If we are open to those charges, what was the hon. gentlemen's conduct to induce the people of this country, by an overwhelming majority, to say: "Get you gone, and let better men take your places." If we are bad, what must you be, who, by the verdict of the intelligent electors of this country on September 18th, 1878, were consigned to the humiliating position you occupy now, and my right hon. friend and his colleagues whose services to the country were known, were restored to office. I would, therefore, recommend the hon. gentleman not to venture upon that line of argument again. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me what signs of the times he sees. I am afraid they are visions; and I think the hon. gentleman must be asleep when these visions come over him. I do not see how any waking man can see any such signs or tokens. As I said before, history is philosophy, teaching by experience; and what does the history of that day and of this teach the people. Why, Sir, when a change of Government is imminent, when the public mind is on the waver, when a Ministry are shaken in the public confidence, there are signs of the times. There are tokens, and they are unmistakable. Do you see them now? Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to portentous signs of the times that point with unerring fidelity, in free countries such as ours, to the direction the public mind is taking. What was the position of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they had been in power for three years and four months? It is true they went to the country with a great majority; but we told them it would be swept from under their feet, and I gave them the reasons why. They were plain and distinctive reasons which, under parliamentary forms of Government, have been found to be

conclusive upon such a question as this. I said: "Look abroad over the face of the country; remember the great majority you had and tell me where it is now." I showed them that, out of sixty-one Government seats that had become vacant, they had only been enabled, including the Ministerial elections—a dozen of them or something like it—to elect forty-seven supporters. I showed them with reference to the twenty-six seats of the Opposition that had become vacant, that we had been able to elect out of them, and out of the seats which had become vacant on the Government side, no less than forty. So that at the end of four years we stood in this House twenty-eight votes on a division better than when the Government was formed. These were the signs of the times—the unmistakable signs of the times; and, Sir, when the Government went to the country we realized them to the fullest extent, the overwhelming verdict of the people confirming the verdict of the by-elections as it almost invariably does. But what is the position of gentlemen opposite to-day? Thirty-four seats have been vacant on the Government side, and out of those thirty-four how many have we won? Thirty-two, Sir, and hon. gentlemen opposite, out of thirty-four seats and in three years and four months have taken exactly two seats from us. What more? Twelve seats on the Opposition side have been vacant. Of course a great many could not become vacant because the Opposition is so small numerically. But twelve seats on that side have been vacant, and out of those twelve we have taken six. So that we stand, to-day, giving them the benefit of the two seats they carried out of the thirty-four that became vacant on our side, eight votes stronger on a division, in consequence of the by-elections, than we were on the day that the General Election was over. I ask the hon. gentleman what, under these circumstances, he thinks the signs of the times point to? I tell the hon. gentleman this—and I have said it elsewhere as well as here—that so long as the people of Canada are compelled to look forward to the administration of its financial affairs by the ex-Minister of Finance of this country, we are safe. I tell the hon. gentleman that the worst sign of the times for us would be his retirement into private life, because it would give his party an opportunity it does not at present possess. I trust he will not do anything so much at variance with our interests. But, as I remarked, at the end of three years and four months we have a majority of ninety members in this House, at our back—a majority strengthened, as I have said, by the free will of the sovereign, independent people of this country; and we are sustained, to an extent

that no Government could expect to be sustained, because there are a variety of things—for instance, disappointed parties looking for a great deal from a Government, who naturally cannot have their expectations realized—which cause Governments to suffer occasional defeats. We, however, stand in this position: that we have the assurance, not only that the sovereign electors endorse, from end to end of Canada, the policy of this Administration, but that they recognise that, under that wise and judicious policy, the blight that fell upon the country under the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite has been removed, and that the true interests of every class of the population is involved in maintaining that great policy to which this Government has committed itself, and which has proved so eminently beneficial to the people of Canada.
